



RECTITUDE OF B. Ed TRAINEES

Dr. C. Siva Sankar

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Education, Rajiv Gandhi University, Doimukh-791112, Arunachal Pradesh.

ABSTRACT

The present paper is an attempt to know the rectitude of B.Ed trainees empirically. Rectitude focuses on ethical behaviour, appropriate habits and values among the individuals. If B.Ed trainees do not possess righteous rectitude, they will not become effective agents in teaching-learning process. The main objective of the study is to find out the significant differences if any, in the rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in gender, educational qualifications, type of group and marital status. The investigator followed 'survey method' and selected the sample of 300 using stratified random sampling technique at Rayalaseema region in Andhra Pradesh of India. The investigator constructed and developed an attitude scale to measure rectitude of prospective teachers studying in Colleges of Education at B.Ed level. The findings of the study are: The t-value (3.026) with respect to As Whole ($M_1=148.878$, $SD_1=20.417$; $M_2=156.052$, $SD_2=20.651$), $P < 0.01$ is significant. It tells that gender differs in rectitude As Whole. The t-values of rectitude scores of B.Ed trainees, for truthfulness (4.679), dutifulness (4.882), good conduct (2.852), helping nature (4.090) and As Whole (4.526) are significant at 0.01 level and t-value for self-control is significant at 0.05 level. It is evident that the variations in the educational qualification have brought significant difference in rectitude of B.Ed trainees for truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and rectitude As Whole. Marital status has not significantly influenced on self-control. It is suggested that the B.Ed trainees should possess not only intra and inter human ethics but also environmental ethics.

KEY WORDS: Rectitude and B.Ed Trainee.

Introduction:

The word "Rectitude" is connected to moral behaviour. Rectitude, so far as it concerns an individual, includes his/her manners, habits and moral values. Manners are concerned with how he/she conduct himself/herself in the company of others. Habits are concerned with such things which affect his/her health and hygiene. Values refer to end state of experience, desires and goals which can be achieved through learning, conditions and socialization. Rectitude is linked with basic virtues like sincerity, simplicity, gentleness, modesty, compassion, humility, courtesy, co-operation, self-reliance, self-control, truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, courage, non-violence, non-stealing, endurance, knowledge, wisdom etc (Rama Rao, 1992; Frankel, 1988).

Rationale of the Study:

Johnson (1962), Boehm (1962), Keasey (1973) and Kohlberg (1981) revealed that all students who had rectitude and morally advanced were bright in various aspects. Kohlberg (1981) and Bull (1969) reported that rectitude was an important factor in social participation and socialization.

Keasey (1973) indicated that rectitude was positively correlated with role-taking abilities which were needed for interaction between the self and the other. Kautner (1976) and Goldsmith (1929) found that rectitude had influenced the personality characteristics of an individual. Rorty and Wong (1990) identified that rectitude was positively connected with internal locus of control, creativity and field-dependence and field-independence, internal locus of control, creativity and field-dependence and field-independence

Hogan (1975) suggested that rectitude could reflect the character and personality of teachers. Wolman (1982) indicated that the rectitude was the feeling of accountability and responsibility. Harris, Mussen and Rutherford (1976) stressed that self-concept was positively related with rectitude. Based on the reviews related to rectitude, it is clear that rectitude is very much needed for individuals in order to manifest their behaviour, thoughts, attributes, motives, feelings, dispositions of the agent. It also influences intelligence, creativity, locus of control, self-control, personality characteristics, role-taking abilities, socialization, field-dependence and field-independence.

Prospective teachers are the key-agents in implementation of educational programmes at various stages after becoming teachers. In regular practice, They have to play many different roles as demonstrator, dispenser of information, task master, disciplinarian, model, mediator, surrogate parent, therapist, midwife, evangelist, persuader, stimulator of inquiry, manager students well-being, real change leader, conveyor of knowledge, an agent of social change, a national builder and the maker of man. If they have not followed righteous rectitude, they will not become effective agents in teaching-learning process (Willson, 1998; NCERT, 1990 and Rao, 1999).

Based on the need of rectitude, the present investigator has thought to do empirical research on rectitude of tribal B.Ed trainees. The researcher has stated the problem as given below.

Statement of the Problem:

"Rectitude of B.Ed Trainees"

Operational Definitions:

- According to Encyclopedia of Values and Morality (1998), rectitude (moral-ity) is concerned with principles, rules, ideals and behavioral patterns.
- In this study, rectitude refers to moral values related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty.

Objectives of the Study:

- To find out the significant differences if any, in the rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in gender.
- To find out the significant differences if any, in the rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in educational qualifications.
- To find out the significant differences if any, in the rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in their type of group.
- To find out the significant differences if any, in the rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among tribal B.Ed trainees due to variation in their marital status.

Hypotheses of the Study:

- There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in gender.
- There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in educational qualifications.
- There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in type of group.
- There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in marital status.

Materials and Methods:

The research design in the present study is descriptive in nature. Hence, the investigator has used 'survey method' to obtain information. The researcher has selected the sample of 300 using stratified random sampling technique at Rayalaseema region in Andhra Pradesh of India. The investigator has constructed and developed an attitude scale to measure rectitude of prospective

teachers studying in Colleges of Education at B.Ed level. The reliability of the tool is 0.905. Intrinsic validity of the attitude scale of rectitude is 0.92. This tool also has possessed face validity, criterion validity and content validity. The dimensions of the tool are truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty. The statistical techniques followed in the present study are mean, SD and t-values.

Results and Discussion:

HO₁: There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among B.Ed trainees due to variation in gender.

Table-1: Showing t-test values of Rectitude Scores of Male and Female B.Ed trainees

Dimensions of Rectitude	Gender				t- values
	Male (N=147)		Female (N=153)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Truthfulness	26.211	4.834	27.471	4.916	2.238*
2. Dutifulness	24.932	4.449	25.941	4.863	1.877@
3. Good Conduct	23.551	3.709	24.163	4.118	1.354@
4. Helping Nature	24.646	5.147	26.824	4.923	3.742**
5. Self-Control	23.612	4.013	24.484	3.948	1.895@
6. Honesty	25.925	4.626	27.170	4.859	2.273*
As whole	148.878	20.417	156.052	20.651	3.026**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

Table-1 reveals that the t-value (3.742) with respect to helping nature at 0.01 level is significant. It denotes that male and female B.Ed trainees studying in Colleges of Education are significantly differed with respect to helping nature. The t-value (3.026) with respect to As Whole at 0.01 level is significant. It tells that gender differs in rectitude As Whole. The 't'-value (2.238) with respect to truthfulness at 0.05 level is significant. It depicts that gender significantly differs in truthfulness. The 't'-value (2.273) with respect to honesty at 0.05 level are significant at 0.05 level. It denotes that male and female B.Ed trainees studying in Colleges of Education are significantly differed with respect to helping nature, truthfulness, honesty and as whole. Contrary to this, the t- values with respect to dutifulness (1.877), good conduct (1.354) and self-control (1.895) are not significant at 0.01 level and 0.05 level. It indicates that there are no variations in dutifulness, good conduct and self-control. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in rectitude of B.Ed trainees due to variation in gender" is rejected. Further, the mean values of male and female B.Ed trainees reveal that female B.Ed trainees have more rectitude (156.052) than male B.Ed trainees (148.878).

HO₂: There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among tribal B.Ed trainees due to variation in educational qualifications.

Table-2: Showing t-test values of Rectitude Scores of B.Ed trainees of Graduation and Post Graduation:

Dimensions of Rectitude	Educational Qualification				t-values
	Graduation (N=203)		Post graduation (N=97)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1.Truthfulness	25.990	4.874	28.660	4.497	4.679**
2. Dutifulness	24.547	4.403	27.330	4.718	4.882**
3.Good conduct	23.394	3.636	24.845	4.335	2.852**
4. Helping nature	24.951	5.088	27.443	4.863	4.090**
5. Self-control	23.655	3.795	24.897	4.287	2.433*
6. Honesty	26.246	4.676	27.216	4.918	1.617@
As whole	148.783	19.671	160.392	21.052	4.526**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

Table-2 shows that the t-values of rectitude scores of B.Ed trainees, for truthfulness (4.679), dutifulness (4.882), good conduct (2.852), helping nature (4.090) and as whole (4.526) are significant at 0.01 level and t-value for self-control is significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that the rectitude of B.Ed trainees vary due to variations in the educational qualification. It means, the variations in the educational qualification have brought significant difference in rectitude of B.Ed trainees for truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and rectitude. Further, it is evident from the mean values that the B.Ed trainees with post graduation have more rectitude (160.392) than the B.Ed trainees with graduation (148.783). On the other hand, t-value of rectitude scores of B.Ed trainees

for honesty (1.617) is not significant at both levels. It means, the variations in the educational qualification have not brought any significant differences in rectitude of tribal B.Ed trainees for honesty. Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in rectitude of tribal B.Ed trainees due to variations in educational qualifications" is rejected for truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty.

HO₃: There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among tribal B.Ed trainees due to variation in type of group.

Table-3: Showing t-test values of Rectitude Scores of B.Ed trainees of Science and Arts Background:

Dimensions of Rectitude	Type of Group				t-values
	Science (N=146)		Arts (N=154)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Truthfulness	27.753	4.824	26.000	4.851	3.138**
2. Dutifulness	26.555	4.666	24.396	4.470	4.088**
3. Good conduct	24.418	3.714	23.338	4.065	2.405*
4. Helping nature	26.390	4.923	25.156	5.287	2.094*
5. Self-control	24.747	3.563	23.403	4.278	2.962**
6. Honesty	27.322	4.371	25.838	5.045	2.728**
Rectitude	157.185	19.284	148.130	21.312	3.862**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

From the table-3, it is revealed that the obtained t- values for truthfulness (3.138), dutifulness (4.088), self-control (2.962), honesty (2.728) and as whole (3.862) are significant at 0.01 level and t-values for good conduct (2.405) and helping nature (2.094) are significant at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variations in tribal B.Ed trainees from Science and Arts group background have brought significant differences in their rectitude with respect to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty. Further, the mean values reveal that the tribal B.Ed trainees from Science group background have more rectitude (157.185) than the counterpart (148.130). Hence, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in rectitude of tribal B.Ed trainees due to variation in type of group" is rejected with respect to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty.

HO₄: There exists no significant difference in rectitude related to truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, self-control and honesty among tribal B.Ed trainees due to variation in marital status.

Table-4: Showing t-test values of Rectitude Scores of B.Ed trainees as per their Marital Status:

Dimensions of rectitude	Marital Status				t-value
	Married (N=96)		Unmarried (N=204)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Truthfulness	25.698	4.811	27.397	4.871	2.842**
2. Dutifulness	24.385	4.154	25.946	4.845	2.874**
3. Good conduct	22.719	3.605	24.402	3.967	3.649**
4. Helping nature	24.260	4.927	26.461	5.102	3.567**
5. Self-control	23.427	4.332	24.353	3.803	1.794@
6. Honesty	25.542	4.975	27.039	4.619	2.488*
7. As whole	146.031	19.777	155.598	20.635	3.854**

Note: ** = Significant at 0.01 level, * = Significant at 0.05 level & @ = Not Significant

From the table-4, it is clear that the obtained t-values for truthfulness (2.842), dutifulness (2.874), good conduct (3.649), helping nature (3.567) and rectitude (3.854) are significant at 0.01 level and t-values for honesty (2.488) is significant at 0.01 level. It means, marital status has significant influence on truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, honesty and as whole. The mean values indicate that the unmarried B.Ed trainees have more rectitude (155.578) than the married B.Ed trainees (146.037). On the contrary, the t-value for self-control (1.794) is not significant at both levels. It means marital status has not significantly influenced on self-control. Thus, the formulated hypothesis, "There exists no significant difference in rectitude of B.Ed trainees due to variation in marital status" is rejected for truthfulness, dutifulness, good conduct, helping nature, honesty and rectitude of tribal B.Ed trainees.

Conclusion:

Applied research in the area of teacher education in connection with psychological, philosophical and moral components, is required for making moralistic agents in real life situations and classroom situations. It gives fruitful results in pre-service teacher education programme, if moral and peace education is prescribed as a core paper in teacher training programme. Rectitude is an essential component for teachers and prospective teachers. Because, it reflects their manners, customs, habits, traditions and values. It stimulates teachers to be accountable for the development of the children in teaching-learning process. Attempts can be made to assess the rectitude of primary, secondary school teachers. It is suggested that the B.Ed trainees should possess not only intra and inter human ethics but also environmental ethics. Case studies can be made in relation to the teachers' teaching aptitude, intellectual level and rectitude. Correlation studies can be made in relation to personality, self-concept, role-taking abilities, adjustment, teachers' effectiveness, teachers' performance, study habits and level of aspiration.

REFERENCES:

1. Abron, S. R., & Irwin, D. M. (1975). Role-taking and moral judgment in five and seven years olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 11, 102.
2. Boehm, L. (1962). The development of conscience: A comparison of American children of different mental and socio-economic levels. *Child development*, 33, 575-590(a).
3. Bull, N. J. (1969). *Moral judgement from Childhood to Adolescence*. London: Houtledge & Kegan Paul.
4. Encyclopaedia of Values and Rectitude. (1998). MacMillan Publishers .Inc, USA, pp.220-225.
5. Fraenkel, J. R. (1988). *How to teach about values: An analytical approach*, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
6. Goldsmith, S. P. N. (1929) Personality, ego development, and moral reasoning differences between feminiTribals and non-feminiTribals. *Dissertation AbTribaltracts International*, 39, 6096-6097-B.
7. Harris, D., Mussen, K., & Rutherford, L. (1976). Group differences in the values within a university. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, Vol. XXIII, No.2, p.72.
8. Hoffman, S. (1977). Intelligence and the development of moral judgement in children. *Journal of genetic psychology*, 130, 27-34.
9. Hogan, R. (1975). Moral development and the Tribalructure of personality. In Depalma, D. J. & Feley J. M. (eds.), *Moral development: Current theory and research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Eribaum Association.
10. Johnson, R. C. (1962). Early Tribaludies of children's moral judgement. *Child development*, 33, 603-605.
11. Kauntner, J. E. (1976). The relationship between moral judgement and personality variables in adult offenders. *Dissertation abTribaltracts international*, 36, 5262-5263.
12. Keasey, C. B. (1973). Experimentally induced change in moral opinions and reasoning. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 26, 30-38.
13. Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays and moral development*, New York: Harper Row.
14. Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our school can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Britain.
15. NCERT. (1990). *Documents on social, moral and spiritual values in education*. New Delhi: NCERT.
16. Rama Rao, K. (1994). *Moral education: A practical approach*. Mysore: RIMSE.
17. Report of the Committee on Religious and moral in Tribalruction. (1959). MiniTribalry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi.
18. Rorty, A. O. (1988). *Three myths of moral theory in mind and in action*. BoTribalon, MA:Beacon.
19. Willson. (1998). *Moral thinking*. New York: Routledge.